

### REMARKS

In reply to the Office Action of March 1, 2011, Applicants have: canceled claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-25, 27, 28, 31, 33, 36, 44-49, 52, 54-57, and 59-63; amended claims 30, 34, 35, 37, 38, 58, and 64; and added new claims 65-85. Accordingly, claims 30, 34, 35, 37-43, 58, and 64-85 are pending, with claims 30 and 64 in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 64 is allowed, and for indicating that, if re-written in independent form, claims 36 and 37 would also be allowable. In this reply, Applicants have made only a minor amendment to claim 64 to correct a typographical error, and therefore believe that claim 64 remains allowable.

Prior claim 30 depended from claim 1, and covered a radiation-emitting component that included the leadframe recited in claim 1. Prior claim 36 depended from claim 30 through claim 33. In this reply, Applicants have placed claim 30 in independent form by amending claim 30 to include the features of previous claims 1, 33, and 36. In view of these amendments, Applicants believe that amended independent claim 30 is allowable, and therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of prior dependent claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and allowance of independent claim 30, in the next Office communication.

Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-25, 27, 28, 31, 33, 36, 44-49, 52, 54-57, and 59-63 have been canceled, making the rejections of these claims moot. Claims 34, 35, 37, 38, and 58 have been amended to correct their dependence and/or to ensure that the language of these claims is consistent with the language of independent claim 30. Following these amendments, claims 34, 35, 37-43, and 58 each depend from independent claim 30.

Claims 34, 35, 38-43, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hochstein (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0030866, "Hochstein") in view one or more of Durocher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,103, "Durocher") and Kumamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,129,993, "Kumamoto"). Without addressing or conceding the merits of these proposed combinations of references, Applicants note that as explained above, independent claim 30 is allowable. At least by virtue of their dependence from

claim 30, each of claims 34, 35, 38-43, and 58 is also allowable, and Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

New claims 65-85 have been added in this reply. These claims recite the subject matter of previously pending claims 17-25, 27, 2-4, 6-12, and 15, respectively (all of which have been canceled in this reply). Each of claims 65-85 depends from either claim 30 or from claim 64, both of which are allowable as explained above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claims 65-85 be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants ask that the application be allowed.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which Applicants have: (a) addressed certain comments of the Examiner does not mean that Applicants concede other comments of the Examiner; (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims; or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that Applicants concede any of the Examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Fees for the Petition for Extension of Time are being paid concurrently on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 12406-0127001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 1, 2011

/Marc M. Wefers Reg. N. 56,842/  
Marc M. Wefers  
Reg. No. 56,842

Customer Number 26161  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945